

**MINUTES OF  
FAIRFAX COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2005**

UNAPPROVED  
NOVEMBER 23, 2005

PRESENT: John R. Byers, Mount Vernon District  
Frank A. de la Fe, Hunter Mill District  
Janet R. Hall, Mason District  
James R. Hart, Commissioner At-Large  
Nancy Hopkins, Dranesville District  
Ronald W. Koch, Sully District  
Kenneth A. Lawrence, Providence District  
Rodney L. Lusk, Lee District  
Laurie Frost Wilson, Commissioner At-Large

ABSENT: Walter L. Alcorn, Commissioner At-Large  
Suzanne F. Harsel, Braddock District  
Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Springfield District

//

The meeting was called to order at 8:14 p.m. by Vice Chairman John R. Byers, in the Board Auditorium of the Fairfax County Government Center at 12000 Government Center Parkway, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

//

**COMMISSION MATTERS**

Commissioner Koch MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION CONCUR WITH "CONSENT AGENDA ITEM" 456A-Y97-8-2, VERIZON.

Without objection, it was so ordered.

//

Commissioner Lawrence MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE PUBLIC HEARING ON SE 2005-PR-009, SUNRISE ASSISTED LIVING, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF DECEMBER 8, 2005.

Commissioner Koch seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Harsel, and Murphy absent from the meeting.

//

ORDER OF THE AGENDA

In the absence of Secretary Harsel, Vice Chairman Byers established the following order of the agenda:

1. 2232-S05-15 - FAIRFAX COUNTY FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT
2. PUBLIC FACILITIES AMENDMENTS (SUBDIVISION STREET STANDARDS AND SIDEWALKS)
3. ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ("PUBLIC USE" DEFINITION)

This order was accepted without objection.

//

2232-S05-15 - FAIRFAX COUNTY FACILITIES MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT - Appl. to provide lights for three existing baseball fields and to add a storage/utility shed and an electronic scoreboard on the Lincoln, Lewis, Vannoy parcel located at 12470 Braddock Road. Tax Map 66-2 ((1)) 4D. Area III. SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT. PUBLIC HEARING.

Commissioner de la Fe announced that he would be handling this case in Commissioner Murphy's absence.

Leanna Hush, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended that the Planning Commission find the proposal to be substantially in accord with provisions of the adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Responding to questions from Vice Chairman Byers, Commissioner Wilson said the lighting for athletic fields in the Lorton and Laurel Hill areas did not meet the recently adopted zoning Ordinance Amendment on lighting.

Luis Lopez, Facilities Management Department, stated that the county had initiated a partnership with the Southwest Youth Association (SYA) in 1995 to develop and maintain the subject ball fields. He said lighting of the fields would maximize their use and provides a much needed recreation amenity to the community. He explained that the new lighting system would utilize the latest technology and comply with current lighting standards.

In response to questions from Commissioner Lawrence, Mr. Lopez said the use of the ball fields was open to the public; lights would be used for games only, not practices; and the fields would be subject to the same rules and regulations as other lighted fields in the County.

Commissioner de la Fe explained that the standard Park Authority cutoff time for field lighting was 11:00 p.m., but under special circumstances exceptions could be made.

David Marshall, Planning Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, responding to questions from Commissioner Hart, said that the houses on George McKay Court were located north of the subject property and that the north field would not be lighted.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Lopez said that a mechanical device would turn off the lights and that an SYA representative would provide more detailed information.

Vice Chairman Byers asked the SYA representative to address the Commission.

Andy Lachance, 13407 Cavalier Woods Drive, Clifton, President of SYA Little League, said that the County would control the lights through a computer program and that they would automatically be turned on and off at the designated times.

Vice Chairman Byers called the first listed speaker and recited rules for testimony before the Commission.

William Malthouse, 5201 George McKay Court, Fairfax, said that he was opposed to the application because of light pollution. He said that his house was approximately 800 feet from the north boundary of the subject property and that the light spill would have a negative affect on his property value and his quality of life. Mr. Malthouse requested that the hours of field use be enforced. He also requested that a telephone number be posted so citizens could call if the lights were not turned off at the appropriate time. He added that he appreciated the concessions made by the applicant.

Mr. Lachance said he supported the application to extend the use of existing fields because it was becoming increasingly difficult in Fairfax County to develop new fields due to limited space and cost restrictions. He stated that the Little League in this area was possibly the only group that did not have a lighted baseball field within its boundaries. He added this location was appropriate because it had two level-one 60-foot baseball fields; there was sufficient noise and light buffer; and it was consistent with the use of other land in the area. Mr. Lachance said that concessions had been made to address the neighbors' concerns by agreeing to an automatic light cutoff at 10:00 p.m. and by dropping a request to light the 90-foot ballfield on the north boundary. (A copy of his remarks is in the date file.)

Gary Flather, 14620 Algretus Drive, Centreville, President of SYA Centreville, spoke in support of the lighting and recognized those persons in the audience who supported the application.

Commissioner Hall commented that she appreciated the work done by SYA volunteers and indicated she would support the application.

Frank Crandall, 900 Turkey Run Road, McLean, representing the McLean Citizens Association, said that as a member of the Environmental Quality Advisory Council he had written the Light Pollution section of the *Annual Report on the Environment*. He said that the new technology produced approximately 900 lumens, which would reduce glare to acceptable levels. Mr. Crandall suggested that approval of the application be conditioned upon the recent Park Authority study on athletic field lighting and comply with the new standards.

Commissioner de la Fe announced that the Park Authority would be holding a meeting about the new technology on athletic field lighting on Thursday, November 17, 2005 at 7:00 p.m., in the lecture hall at Woodson High School, Fairfax.

Rob Hahne, 14800 Sun Meadow Court, Centreville, Chair of the Fairfax County Better Business Council and a representative on the Fairfax County Athletic Council, spoke in support of the application. He distributed a handout that depicted the layout of the fields from different angles. Mr. Hahne said the SYA Little League was one of the largest leagues in the County but did not have lighted fields. He said he appreciated the concessions made by the applicant to the neighbors including not lighting to the northern field and changing the light cutoff time. (A copy of the handout is in the date file.)

In response to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Mr. Hahne said houses could be seen only from the field facing southwest.

Rob Sanmartin, 5522 Chestermill Drive, Fairfax, Vice President of SYA Little League and County representative for the Baseball Council, spoke in support of the application and said that a tree buffer should address the concerns of the neighbors. He added that in the event the lights were left on, a telephone number would be posted on the light switch box.

Michael Sedlock, 14387 Emerald Pool Court, Centreville, spoke in support of the application. He said lighting the ballfield would allow evening games and alleviate time constraints for using the field. He added that his house bordered Ellanor C. Lawrence Park and the lighted fields there did not adversely affect his quality of life.

There were no further speakers; therefore, Vice Chairman Byers called upon Mr. Lopez for rebuttal remarks but Mr. Lopez declined.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Vice Chairman Byers closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner de la Fe for action on this application. (A verbatim transcript is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner de la Fe MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER DECISION ONLY ON 2232-S05-15, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF NOVEMBER 9, 2005, WITH THE RECORD REMAINING OPEN FOR WRITTEN COMMENT.

Commissioners Hopkins and Lusk seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Harsel, and Murphy absent from the meeting.

//

PUBLIC FACILITIES AMENDMENTS (SUBDIVISION STREET STANDARDS AND SIDEWALKS) - To Amend Chapters 6, 7 and 8 of the Fairfax Public Facilities Manual (PFM) and the Code of the County of Fairfax, Virginia, §§ 101-2-9 and 104-1-3 as follows: Pursuant to the authority granted by *Virginia Code* Section 15.2-2241 and in order to comply with Virginia Administrative Code 24 VAC 30-91-10 through -160 (Virginia Department of Transportation 2005 Subdivision Street Requirements), the amendments include major PFM revisions. The amendments establish geometric criteria for subdivision streets with up to 4000 Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT). The PFM amendments delete any detailed specifications for streets with over 4000 ADT and instead provide that streets with over 4000 ADTs shall be designed in accordance with the VDOT road design manual. Pavement widths will range from 16 feet to 40 feet, depending on ADT and whether the street is ditch lined or built with curb and gutter. Shoulder width will range from 4 to 11 feet and sidewalk width must be five feet or include passing areas according to the PFM amendments. Stopping sight distance changed depending on the ADT by as much as a 4% increase or 23% decrease. Intersection sight distance requirements increased by up to 12% for 2 lane and 4 lane roads and the PFM amendments also divided the new sight distance requirements on 4 lane into undivided roads and divided roads. The new intersection sight distance requirements for undivided 4 lane roads range from 295 feet for a design speed of 25 miles per hour (mph) and 650 feet for a design speed of 55 mph. The new intersection sight distance requirements for divided 4 lane roads range from 325 feet for a design speed of 25 mph and 710 feet for a design speed of 55 mph. Right-of-way widths range from 41 feet to 66 feet, depending on ADT, whether the street is ditch lined or built with curb and gutter, or if a sidewalk is required. The PFM amendments also require the driveway entrance radii to be up to 20 feet and the driveway width at the street connection to be up to 52 feet. The amendments also delete entirely the specifications in the PFM for streets in subdivisions with 5-acre parcels or low density rural subdivisions and also limit the construction of streets in R-C cluster subdivisions to private streets. The PFM amendments also add a section to require that curb inlets in the VDOT right-of-way be designed in accordance with the VDOT drainage manual. The amendments also include the following revisions to the PFM sidewalk provisions to improve pedestrian accessibility: require curb cut ramps and passing areas every 200 feet (or a five-foot-wide sidewalk), require construction of sidewalks on both sides of street in subdivisions with lots ranging from 13,001 square feet to 18,000 square feet and require construction of sidewalk on one side of street in subdivisions with lots averaging 18,000 square feet to 52,000 square feet. The PFM amendments include revisions

to the traffic-calming and cut-through programs to allow for alternate types and modification to spacing requirements of traffic-calming devices, revision to the traffic-calming and cut-through community support requirements to require that at least 50% of the total ballots be cast and that at least 60% vote to approve the traffic calming or cut-through, and provision for modification to procedures in the administration of the traffic-calming and cut-through programs. Editorial adjustments to the Code of the County of Fairfax, VA §§ 101-2-9 and 104-1-3 are also included to remove outdated text. Copies of the full text of the aforementioned proposed amendments and staff report are on file and may be inspected at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, VA. For the convenience of the public, copies of the full text will also be available for inspection at the County's Regional and Community Public Libraries. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING.

Judith Cronauer, Code Analysis Division, Department of Public Works and Environmental Services (DPWES), presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. She noted that staff recommended approval of the application.

Responding to questions from Vice Chairman Byers and Commissioner de la Fe, Christopher Wells, Fairfax County Department of Transportation, explained that the changes proposed would significantly increase the requirement for sidewalks and bring the County into conformance with national standards as recommended by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. He said the new standards would balance the need for additional sidewalks without overburdening developers.

In response to questions from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Cronauer explained that both the metric and English measurements were denoted on the PFM and that the sidewalk determination would be based on lot size not zoning; therefore, on a lot averaging 18,000 to 52,000 square feet, sidewalks would be required only on one side and on smaller lots they would be required on both sides.

In response to a question from Commissioner Hart, Mr. Wells said he would review the draft update to the Transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan to determine if the policy regarding sidewalks was consistent with the proposed revisions to the PFM. Mr. Wells explained that staff strongly supported having sidewalks on both sides of the street but that the Engineering Standards Review Committee was not in favor of it in all cases so a compromise had been reached.

Commissioner Wilson announced that she would be deferring the decision on the proposed amendment to address concerns recently raised by the Northern Virginia Building Association.

Responding to a question from Commissioner Lusk, James Patteson, Land Development Services, DPWES, said he would confer with the County Attorney's Office to determine if an inflationary provision could be included for the money escrowed for the future construction of sidewalks. Commissioner Wilson asked Mr. Patteson to also ask the County Attorney's Office if unused sidewalk escrow funds could be combined with unused escrowed money for other projects. Ms. Cronauer explained that the County Attorney had issued an opinion stating that the County did not have the legal authority to require contributions for a general trail fund in lieu of escrows for particular trails.

Commissioner Lawrence asked that the Policy Plan be reviewed to ensure that it did not conflict with newly emerging design paradigms like the transit-oriented developments.

Vice Chairman Byers called for speakers from the audience.

Frank Crandall, 900 Turkey Run Road, McLean, representing the McLean Citizens Association, and speaking as a member of the Environmental Quality Advisory Council, said sidewalks added impervious surface which increased stormwater management problems and could interfere with newly-emerging low impact development techniques for managing stormwater onsite.

In response to a comment from Vice Chairman Byers, Mr. Crandall said that sidewalks could only be made partially pervious. He noted that stormwater management and sidewalks were competing interests.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Vice Chairman Byers closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Wilson for action on this application. (A verbatim transcript is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Wilson MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON THE PROPOSED COUNTY CODE AMENDMENT AND PROPOSED PFM AMENDMENT RELATED TO THE 2005 VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION SUBDIVISION STREET REQUIREMENTS, NEW SIDEWALK REQUIREMENTS, AND TRAFFIC CALMING AND CUT-THROUGH PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS, AND THE EDITORIAL ADJUSTMENTS TO CHAPTERS 101 and 104, *CODE OF COUNTY OF FAIRFAX*, TO A DATE CERTAIN OF NOVEMBER 9, 2005, WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENTS.

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Harsel, and Murphy absent from the meeting.

//

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ("PUBLIC USE" DEFINITION) - To amend Chapter 112 of the 1976 Code of the County of Fairfax, as follows: Revise the definition of the term "Public Use" to provide, in part, that an area, building or structure constitutes a public use if it is held, used, owned or controlled primarily for public purposes by the Federal Government, the Commonwealth of Virginia, the Fairfax County government under the direct authority of the Board of Supervisors, or by the Fairfax County School Board or Fairfax County Park Authority, in lieu of the portion of the current definition that provides that the property in question must be held, used, or controlled exclusively for public purposes, without reference to the ownership of the property. In addition, revise the public use definition to state that with respect to the use of parks and/or athletic facilities that are held, used, owned or controlled by the Park Authority or the School Board, any such use by an organized group such as a youth club or educational institution shall be deemed a public use as long as such use is permitted by the Park Authority or School Board, whichever is applicable. Copies of the full text are on file and may be reviewed at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035. For the convenience of the public, access to the full text will also be available for review at the County's website, [www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz](http://www.fairfaxcounty.gov/dpz) under the Zoning heading by clicking on Pending Zoning Ordinance Amendments. COUNTYWIDE. PUBLIC HEARING

William Shoup, Director, Zoning Administration Division, Department of Planning and Zoning, presented the staff report, a copy of which is in the date file. He noted that staff recommended approval of the proposed revisions to the Zoning Ordinance pertaining to public use definition.

In response to a question from Vice Chairman Byers, Mr. Shoup said private parties, such as family gatherings, would be covered under the "primarily for public purposes" definition.

Commissioner de la Fe expressed concern about the unintended consequences resulting from changing an Ordinance before knowing the results of the relevant Supreme Court ruling in *West Lewinsville Heights Citizens Association, et al., versus Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County, Virginia, et al.* and *Board of Zoning Appeals of Fairfax County versus Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County, Virginia, et al.*

Commissioner Hart expressed concerns that citizen groups had not had adequate time to review and develop positions on the proposed amendment; the scope was broader than the Board of Supervisors had intended; and it was in conflict with the Comprehensive Plan. For example, he said according to the Comprehensive Plan, non-residential uses in an RC district requiring special exception or special permit approval must be oriented toward an arterial roadway. He said the proposed amendment, as he interpreted it, would allow non-residential use by-right for an organized groups such as a youth club or an educational institution as long as such use was permitted by the Park Authority or the School Board.



ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT  
("PUBLIC USE" DEFINITION)

October 27, 2005

James Zook, Director, DPZ, pointed out that park land could not be used as an athletic facility by the Park Authority without Planning Commission approval in accordance with *Virginia Code* Section 2232. Commissioner Hart noted that the Comprehensive Plan pertained only to non-residential uses requiring special exception or special permit approval and did not pertain to 2232 applications. Mr. Zook said the Commission could choose not to approve the establishment of a park by denying a 2232 application if it did not comply with a particular policy. Commissioner Hart said he thought the language proposed was too broad since it applied to any area, building, or structure held, used, or owned primarily for public purposes by the Park Authority; therefore, it could be argued that a park fell into that category regardless of 2232 approval. He added that he thought the language should have been tightened up prior to the public hearing.

Commissioner Hart also expressed concern that three terms now being proposed, an organized group, a youth club, or an educational institution, were not defined and there was no established criteria which added ambiguity to the proposed amendment that might not be intentional. Referring to the litigation which had prompted the revisions to the amendment, he said it was doubtful that the Zoning Administrator would issue violations for such events as a wedding, picnic, or farmer's market. Commissioner Hart emphasized the importance of obtaining citizen input on both the proposed amendment as well as on the use of public facilities in general.

Commissioner Wilson expressed concern that the Park Authority could enter into leases of up to 10 years with a local sports group that restricted the public use of a field without public input. She added that the proposed Zoning Ordinance Amendment would allow exceptions to rules that applied to athletic fields including residency requirements. She aligned herself with Commissioner Hart's concerns that more time was needed to adequately review the proposal.

//

The Commission went into recess at 10:05 p.m. and reconvened in the Board Auditorium at 10:18 p.m.

//

The following individuals spoke in opposition to the applicant's proposal, citing concerns that the amendment would deny the right of citizens to participate in decisions regarding the use of public land; that the proposed language was vague; and that there was not enough time for the public to hold workshops and review the impact of the proposed amendment.

- Adrienne Whyte, President, Ellison Heights-Mt. Daniel Civic Association, 6704 West Fall Way, Falls Church (1)
- Jack Hannon, President, West Lewinsville Heights Citizens Association, 7006 Westbury Road, McLean (2)
- Barbara Bodson, 7006 Hamel Hill Court, McLean (3)

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT  
("PUBLIC USE" DEFINITION)

October 27, 2005

- Don Huff, 1563 Mary Ellen Court, McLean (4)
- Bob Rosenbaum, 1601 Mary Ellen Court, McLean, (5)
- Paul Wieland, President, McLean Hamlet Citizens, Inc., 8112 Touchstone Terrace, McLean (6)
- Stephen Sulzer, 7000 Symphony Court, McLean, (7)
- Desmond O'Rourke, 7020 Westbury Road, McLean, (8)
- John Pachter, 7004 Hamel Hill Court, McLean (9)
- Jane Edmondson, President, Lewinsville Coalition, 7804 Ariel Way, McLean (10)
- Susan Turner, President, McLean Citizens Association, 1210 Daviswood Drive, McLean (11)
- William Byrnes, 7921 Old Falls Road, McLean (12)
- Frank Crandall, McLean Citizens Association, 900 Turkey Run Road, McLean (13)
- Jody Bennett, 1459 Hunter View Farms, Vienna (14)

In response to a question from Commissioner Hart, Ms. Bennett said that the Hunter Mill Defense League had not yet had an opportunity to discuss the proposed amendment.

- Elizabeth Rothrock, 7010 Hamel Hill Court, McLean (15)
- Susan Bartram, McLean Hunt Estates Civic Association, 1204 Winter Hunt Road, McLean (16)
- Deborah M. Reyher, Esquire, Wedderburn Neighbors, 8628 Redwood Drive, Vienna (17)
- Fran Wallingford, Pine Ridge Civic Association, 3311 Mantua Drive, Fairfax (18)
- John Ulfelder, Great Falls Citizens Association, 9151 Old Dominion Drive, McLean (19)
- Carol Hawn, Western Fairfax County Citizens Association, 6500 Harvest Mill Court, Centreville (20)
- Rebecca Cate, 8119 Westchester Drive, Vienna (21)

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT  
("PUBLIC USE" DEFINITION)

October 27, 2005

In response to a question from Commissioner Wilson, Ms. Cate said that the Fairfax County Federation of Citizens Associations had voted to recommend deferral for at least 90 days due to insufficient time to review the merits of the proposed amendment.

- Judith Heisinger, Bull Run Civic Association, 7401 Bull Run Drive, Centreville (22)
- Robert Robertory, South County Federation, 8605 Cross Chase Court, Fairfax Station (23)

Messrs. Hannon, Rosenbaum, Wieland, Pachter, and Ms. Edmondson submitted their statements in writing, copies of which are in the date file.

Jon Gundersen, 840 Maple Avenue, McLean, (24) said that Lewinsville Park was used primarily by children living in Fairfax County. He added that a reasonable solution could be found and thought had to be given to who used and benefited from park facilities.

Ralph Wills, 13105 Melrae Court, Fairfax, (25) representing the Chantilly Youth Association said public/private partnerships were necessary to provide and maintain athletic fields that the County could not provide due to fiscal constraints. He noted that a recent Park Authority needs assessment had indicated that at the present time the County needed 98 more rectangular playing fields. He said the partnership his organization had with the Park Authority had been very successful and not all such arrangements needed a public hearing.

Commissioner Wilson said that although Mr. Wills' position about the need for public hearings might not be shared by all, she said it was important for athletic organizations to participate in the process.

Kley Parkhurst, 1348 Lancia Drive, McLean, (26) said that public/private partnerships were necessary to build and maintain fields. He said the use of Lewinsville Park by McLean Youth Soccer (MYS) had been discussed in community meetings. He pointed out that the Supreme Court of Virginia had not ruled on the merits of the Lewinsville Park case, but had rejected the appeal based on a failure to meet a deadline. He explained that MYS was a public youth organization and as such had permission to use the field. He said Marymount University had paid one-half of the approximately \$800,000 to build the artificial turf field and used it primarily during school hours when it was not used by MYS.

There were no further speakers; therefore, Vice Chairman Byers called upon Mr. Shoup for closing comments.

Mr. Shoup said that this amendment was intended to clarify, not redefine, public use. He stated that groups like MYS were considered public and therefore a distinction could not be made between their use of a public facility and uses such as weddings and farmer's markets. Mr. Shoup pointed out that private organizations and educational institutions currently used public facilities and there would be no benefit to subject all types of uses to the public hearing process.

ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT  
("PUBLIC USE" DEFINITION)

October 27, 2005

He noted that the only court of law which had ruled on the merits of the case, the Fairfax County Circuit Court, had upheld the Zoning Administrator's determination in the Lewinsville Park case and as stated earlier, the appeal had been rejected by the Virginia Supreme Court, based not on the merits of the case, but on a technicality only.

Mr. Zook stated for the record that the Board of Supervisors had authorized the advertisement of the proposed amendment at the request of staff; that neither the Board nor the Dranesville District Supervisor, Joan DuBois, had initiated it.

Commissioner Hart suggested that if the amendment was readvertised, the focus should be on the character of the use itself, not on the identity of the tenant and landlord.

There were no further comments or questions from the Commission and staff had no closing remarks; therefore, Vice Chairman Byers closed the public hearing and recognized Commissioner Wilson for action on this application. (A verbatim transcript is in the date file.)

//

Commissioner Wilson MOVED THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION DEFER THE DECISION ONLY ON THE ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENT ON PUBLIC USE DEFINITION TO A DATE CERTAIN OF NOVEMBER 17, 2005 WITH THE RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN FOR WRITTEN AND ELECTRONIC COMMENT.

Commissioner Lawrence seconded the motion which carried unanimously with Commissioners Alcorn, Harsel, and Murphy absent from the meeting.

//

The meeting was adjourned at 12:42 a.m.

Peter F. Murphy, Jr., Chairman

Suzanne F. Harsel, Secretary

Audio and video recordings of this meeting are available at the Planning Commission Office, 12000 Government Center Parkway, Suite 330, Fairfax, Virginia 22035.

Minutes by: Susan M. Donovan

Approved on: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Linda B. Rodeffer, Clerk to the  
Fairfax County Planning Commission